UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/452,328	11/30/1999	SWAIN W. PORTER	003646.P009	1160

25943   7590   04/10/2003

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
JOHNSON, MARLON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States
> before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the
> treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application
> published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was
> published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
> invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States
> for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the
> treaty defined in section 351(a).

2.   Claims 1, 2, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Rubinstein et al (5,913,215).

In considering claim 1,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for assisting a user of the client

system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising:

retrieving and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a

first information page having content, responsive to user direction (see col. 15,

lines 8-17; Fig. 8, Step 805; Fig. 9, Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View

Window 1005); and

automatically assembling and augmenting the first information page being

browsed with one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more

information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on a

portion of the content of said first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and

51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005).

In considering claim 2,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page,

analysis of the first information page to determine the portion of the content of said first

information page on which said automatic assembling and augmenting is based (keyword

phrases) (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820).

In considering claim 11,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said first information page is an

information page that is inherently constituted using some type of mark-up language.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 6, 7, 8, 18, 21, 22, 30-32, 35, 37, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 1, 21, and

30 above, and further in view of Grefensette et al (6,446,035).

In considering claims 18, 21, 30, and 39,

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he

fails to disclose an augmented method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of

a networked client system to retrieve and browse information in server system. However, Grefensette et al., whose invention is a method for providing techniques that can find groups of people using information about resources the people have accessed, discloses the use of a server system for performing such an augmented method (see col. 12, lines 10-17). Therefore, given the teachings of Grefensette et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by performing the augmented method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information on a server system in order to reduce the processing load of the client system.

In considering claim 30,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on dynamically determined content of the first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the retrieval of a locator of the first information page identifying the third party location, from the client system. Nonetheless, this is a conventional execution of URL relocation and would have been an obvious modification to Rubinstein et al. by a person having ordinary skills in the art. It would have been obvious for a person having

ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by retrieving a locator, identifying a

third party location, from a client system in order to provide another user access to the

first user's information page for possible use.

In considering claim 31,

    Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

retrieving said first information page and dynamically analyzing the retrieved first

information page in real time to determine presence ones of first keywords in said

information page; and said providing of information source identifiers (URLs) to said

client system is made based at least in part on said dynamically determined presence ones

of first keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

In considering claims 6 and 32,

    Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he

fails to disclose a method wherein said analyzing further comprises performing on said

client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second

keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords. However, Grefensette et al.

discloses such a retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first

keywords (via expanded queries) (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig.

2, Box 52). Therefore, given the teachings of Grefensette et al., it would have been

obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by

performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page,

retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords in order to

obtain further expansion of the first set of keywords to further limit the returned

information source identifiers based upon the first and/or the second keywords.

In considering claims 7 and 22,

Grefensette et al. discloses a method wherein said automatic assembling and augmenting comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages associated with the second keywords, from one or more information source tables, using said second keywords (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52).

In considering claim 8,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises loading/downloading said one or more tabs of information sources onto the client system (see col. 16, lines 9-13; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window 1105).

In considering claim 18,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location by the client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, related first keywords of presence ones of keywords in the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820); and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received related first keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses the retrieval of first keywords related to the presence

ones of second keywords, where at least presence ones of the second keywords of the

first information page are dynamically determined by the client system in real time on

retrieval of the first information page (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67;

Fig. 2, Box 52).

In considering claim 21,

Rubinstein et al. discloses , an automated method for facilitating provision of

assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the

method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third

party location (various search engines) by the client system a first information

page to be browsed on the client system, presence ones of first keywords in the

first information page, where presence ones of the first keywords of the first

information page are dynamically determined in real time by the client system on

retrieval of the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820);

and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information

source identifiers (URLs) identifying a plurality information pages that may be

additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received presence ones of first

keywords (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

In considering claim 35,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a client system comprising:

a display (see Fig. 4, Display 409); and

an interface to facilitate augmented viewing of a first retrieved information

page having contents, including an analyzer (linguistic analyzer) equipped to

dynamically assemble a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a

plurality of information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in

part on a portion of said content of the first retrieved information page (see Fig. 8,

Step 820; Fig. 9, Control Window 900).

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses a browser to facilitate augmented viewing of a first

retrieved information page having contents (see col. 10, lines 38-44).

In considering claim 37,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a client system wherein the client system further

comprises an information source database having a plurality of keywords and a plurality

of information source identifiers associated with the keywords (see Fig. 11, Fig. 13).

In considering claim 39,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a server system comprising:

a network interface to couple the server system to a network (in order for

the server system to communicate over the network, it needs a network interface);

an information source database having a first plurality of keywords and a

plurality of associated information source identifiers of the first keywords,

identifying a plurality of information pages that may be additionally retrieved, to

facilitate augmented provision of dynamically assembled information source

identifiers by an interface of a coupled client system, based at least in part on

content of a first information page retrieved from a third party location for

browsing on said client system (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820; Fig. 9,

Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005; Fig. 12, Words

View Window 1200).

Additionally,

Grefensette et al. discloses a browser to facilitate augmented provision of

dynamically assembled information source identifiers (see col. 10, lines 38-44).

In considering claim 40,

Grefensette et al. discloses a system further comprising a keyword database,

having a first and second plurality of keywords, the first and second plurality of

keywords being related, to facilitate determination of related second keywords of

presence ones of first keywords in the first retrieved information page (see col. 13, lines

28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52; Fig. 6, Database 232).

5.   Claims 3-5, 9, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. and Grefensette et al. as applied to claims 1 and 30

above, and further in view of Davies et al (6,353,827).

In considering claim 3,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said analysis comprises performing

on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, scanning of

said first information page for unique words presence, accessing a current table of

keywords to determine if any of the unique words are to be considered as keywords, and

outputting those unique words that should be so considered as the presence ones of first

keywords (see col. 16, lines 27-45).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he

fails to disclose the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords.

However, Davies et al., whose invention is a method and system for identifying

associated keywords in a data set, discloses such a determination of unique nouns to be

considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines 6-12). Therefore, given the teachings of

Davies et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to

modify Rubinstein et al. by determining the presence of unique nouns that are to be

considered as keywords in order to exclude verbs, adverbs, and adjectives from

consideration as keywords, as they are more general than nouns.

In considering claim 4,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

designating to a browser of the client system a first of a plurality of tables of keywords as

the current table of keywords (see col. 12, lines 51-54; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window

1105; Fig. 12, Words View Window 1200).

In considering claim 5,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

loading/downloading said plurality of tables of keywords onto the client system (see col.

16, lines 9-13; Fig. 11, Phrases View Window 1105).

In considering claim 9,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein said automatic assembling and

augmenting comprises performing on the client system in real time, on retrieval of the

information page, assembly of the one or more information source identifiers (URLs)

based at least in part on the presence ones of first keywords in said first information page

(see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

In considering claims 25 and 26,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

receiving from said client system in real time, on retrieval from a third party location by a client system a first information page to be browsed on the client system, unique words of the first information page, where the unique word are dynamically determined in real time by the client system on retrieval of the first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820); and

in response, providing to said client system a plurality of information source identifiers identifying a plurality information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on said received unique words (see Fig. 13, Links View Window 1300).

Additionally,

Davies et al. discloses the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines 6-12).

Furthermore,

Grefensette et al. discloses the use of a server system for performing the augmented method for facilitating provision of assistance to a user of a networked client system to retrieve and browse information (see col. 12, lines 10-17).

6.   Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. and

Grefensette et al. as applied to claims 1, 21, and 30 above, and further in view of Finseth

et al (6,271,840).

In considering claim 12,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

displaying on said display a selected one of a second information page corresponding to a

first of the additional information pages (see Fig. 13, Links View Window).

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he

fails to disclose displaying a thumbnail of the second information page. However,

Finseth et al., whose invention is a method for providing graphical outputs from search

engine results, discloses such a thumbnail of a retrieved information page (see Fig. 7,

Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52). Therefore, given the teachings of Finseth et

al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify

Rubinstein et al. by displaying a thumbnail of the second information page in order to

view a physical image of the information page.

In considering claims 13 and 16,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein said displaying of a thumbnail

comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first

information page, a selected one of (a) retrieving said thumbnail and (b) retrieving said

second information page and dithering said retrieved second information page to form

said thumbnail (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 14 and 17,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein said displaying of a thumbnail is made

responsive to proximate placement of a cursor next to a first information source identifier

corresponding to said second information page (see col. 8, lines 45-55).

In considering claim 15,

Rubinstein et al. discloses an automated method for assisting a user of the client system to retrieve and browse information, the method comprising:

retrieving and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having content, responsive to user direction (see col. 15, lines 8-17; Fig. 8, Step 805; Fig. 9, Control Window 900; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005);

performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, analysis of the first information page to determine at least a portion of the content of said first information page (see col. 16, lines 7-13; Fig. 8, Step 820);

automatically assembling and augmenting the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers identifying one or more information pages that may be additionally retrieved, based at least in part on the automatically determined portion of the content of said first information page (see col. 15, lines 22-32 and 51-53; Fig. 8, Step 815; Fig. 10, Contents View Window 1005); and

Additionally,

Finseth et al. discloses presenting on the display, responsive to a user event, a thumbnail of a second information page corresponding to a first of the identified information pages (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52).

In considering claims 23, 28, and 33,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises providing to said client system a thumb nail of a second information page corresponding to a first of said information source identifiers (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52). In considering claims 24, 29, and 34,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises retrieving an information page and dithering the information page to form said thumbnail (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 43-52).
In considering claim 19,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises providing to said client system thumbnail of a second information page corresponding to a first of said information source identifiers (see Fig. 7, Rendered Images 142; col. 5, lines 43-52). In considering claim 20,

Finseth et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises retrieving an information page an dithering the information page to form said thumbnail (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 43-52).
In considering claims 38 and 42,

Finseth et al. discloses a system further comprises a dithering module to dither a second information page retrieved to augment the first retrieved information page, to generate a thumbnail of the second retrieved information page (see Fig. 1, Web Page Renderer Process 52; col. 5, lines 44-51).

7.   Claims 10 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubinstein et al. and Grefensette et al. as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Davies et al.

In considering claim 10,

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the retrieval of a locator of the first information page identifying the third party location, from the client system. Nonetheless, this is a conventional execution of URL relocation and would have been an obvious modification to Rubinstein et al. by a person having ordinary skills in the art. It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by retrieving a locator, identifying a third party location, from a client system in order to provide another user access to the first user's information page for possible use.

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose the determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords. However, Davies et al., whose invention is a method and system for identifying associated keywords in a data set, discloses such a determination of unique nouns to be considered as keywords (see col. 14, lines 6-12). Therefore, given the teachings of Davies et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by determining the presence of unique nouns that are to be considered as keywords in order to exclude verbs, adverbs, and adjectives from consideration as keywords, as they are more general than nouns.

Although Rubinstein et al. shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he fails to disclose a method wherein said analyzing further comprises performing on said client system in real time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords. However, Grefensette et al., whose invention is a method for providing techniques that can find groups of people

using information about resources the people have accessed, discloses such a retrieval of

second keywords related to the presence ones of first keywords (via expanded queries)

(see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52). Therefore, given the

teachings of Grefensette et al., it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary

skills in the art to modify Rubinstein et al. by performing on said client system in real

time, on retrieval of the first information page, retrieval of second keywords related to the

presence ones of first keywords in order to obtain further expansion of the first set of

keywords to further limit the returned information source identifiers based upon the first

and/or the second keywords.

In considering claim 27,

Rubinstein et al. discloses a method wherein the method further comprises

dynamically determining related second keywords of said presence ones of first

keywords; and said providing of information source identifiers to said client system is

further made based at least in part on said dynamically determined related second

keywords (see col. 13, lines 28-35, lines 37-48, lines 54-67; Fig. 2, Box 52).

8.   Claims 36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rubinstein et al. as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Davies et al.

and Gilmour (6,377,949).

In considering claims 36 and 41,

Although Rubinstein et al. and Davies et al. show substantial features of the

claimed invention, they fail to specifically disclose using a lexical analyzer to facilitate

determination of unique nouns in the first retrieved information page. However,

Gilmour, whose invention discloses a method of assigning a confidence level to a term

within an electronic document, discloses such a lexical analyzer (Fig. 2, Lexicon

Controller 45c; col. 9, lines 46-53) (Fig. 2, Lexicon Database 49; col. 14, lines 49-55).

Therefore, given the teachings of Gilmour, a person having ordinary skills in the art

would have recognized the advantages of modifying Sato et al. for the purpose of

allowing the search to compare the users' query with the words of a language and their

definitions.

Response to Arguments

9.   In view of the Reply Brief filed on March 17, 2003, PROSECUTION IS

HEREBY REOPENED. A rebuttal to the Reply Brief set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the

following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by

a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or

1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

10.   Applicant's arguments filed March 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Applicant(s) states on page2, lines 5-10, that the examiner failed to provide a

basis of rejection for claim 40. In response, this oversight from the previous office action

has been corrected, as examiner has provided a basis for the rejection of claim 40 as given above.

Applicant(s) argue on page 3, lines 21-25, page 4, lines 12-17, and page 5, lines 17-19, that Rubinstein et al. fails to disclose any augmentation being performed against an information page being retrieved and being browsed at the instruction of the user. The applicant(s) arguments are not persuasive. Browsing simply refers to observing information. The control window 900 in Figure 9, which has been identified as the information page, does in fact contain content that can be browsed, via the button 902, in the form of previous search queries (see col. 15, lines 12-21). It appears that applicant(s) is referring to the browsing of content on a web page, which was never stated in the claims. Even if the browsing of content on a web page was claimed, Grefensette et al. discloses an augmentation being performed against a web page being retrieved and browsed at the instruction of the user (see col. 2, lines 60-66).

Applicant(s) argues on page 5, lines 19-20, and page 7, lines 9-12, that Rubinstein et al. fails to teach or suggest the server generating and providing augmentation on the content of the information page being browsed, as well as identified keywords being provided to any server. In response, the examiner has modified the previous office action to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, in further view of Grenstette et al., who does disclose such a server(s) for performing those tasks (see col. 12, lines 10-16).

Applicant(s) argue on page 7, lines 13-25, that none of the information page contents will be part of the augmentation generated under Rubinstein et al. The arguements are not persuasive. As stated earlier, the previous search queries that can be browsed through and selected do in fact constitute dynamic content, as that list of queries

will always be updated upon each search, as well being augmented upon each search

conducted.

Conclusion

11.   This action is made final. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy

as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Marlon Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 305-

4642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to

5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glen Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3230.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Marlon B. Johnson

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100